

Burns & McDonnell
ENGINEERS - ARCHITECTS - CONSULTANTS

October 15, 1987

075B
SITE Elliott Shooting Park
ID# mcD98096R333
BREAK 23 Burns & McDonnell
OTHER AR
10-15-87

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1987

CMPL SECTION

Mr David Crawford
U S Environmental Protection Agency
726 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City KS 66101

Elliott Shooting Park
Boatman's First National Bank
Project No 85-170-4

Dear Mr Crawford

This is to transmit the results of recent sampling of the former Health Club property, and to propose a plan for use of the property

Results of Recent Sampling

The area known as the former Health Club property, located to the north-east of the Elliott Shooting Park property, was sampled between August 1987 and September 1987. The sampling was performed according to "Addendum A to the Revised Work Plan for Removal and Sampling and Analysis at the Elliott Shooting Park "

The sampling was performed after lead contaminated soil was removed from Areas SS-1 through SS-5. No soil was removed from Area SS-6, since no lead shot was visible. A ditch was also excavated to the south of Area SS-3 (to the south of the former Health Club building) to divert rain-fall run-off from the Elliott Shooting Park property around the former Health Club property.

The results of the analyses of lead from the first three inches of soil are summarized as follows

<u>Sample No</u>	<u>Total Lead (mg/kg)</u>
SS-1	5,900
SS-2	60,400
SS-3	39,400
SS-4	102
SS-5	72,600
SS-6	264

40165451



SUPERFUND RECORDS

100% EMPLOYEE OWNED

Mr David Crawford

October 15, 1987

-2-

Because of the elevated lead levels, vertical sampling was performed on Areas SS-1, SS-2, SS-3, and SS-5 after removing the top layer of soil. Vertical samples were taken from two locations in each Area and composited by depth until natural soil was reached. The results are as follows:

		Total Lead (mg/kg)				
		Depth				
Sample No		0 to 3"	3 to 6"	6 to 12"	12 to 24"	24 to 36"
SS-1		5,900	19,000	2,590	12,800	1,970
SS-2		41	28	18	25	18
SS-3		113	137	30	16	33
SS-5		371	137	1,821	134	

Proposed Future Work

Areas SS-2 and SS-3 showed low lead levels the entire depth of the fill. The amount of visible lead has been significantly reduced and will be further eliminated by erosion control on the soil bank. It is, therefore, proposed that Areas SS-2 and SS-3, which constitute the soil bank on the southwest and south sides of the property, be capped with at least one foot of clean soil. The areas will then be sodded. Area SS-5, located to the north of the Former Health Club building, will be covered in the same manner. Area SS-4, to the north of the parking lot, will be resodded as required.

Because of the elevated lead levels in Area SS-1, it is proposed that the fill material in this area be removed and replaced with clean soil. The area affected is the soil bank from the tree line on the northwest side of the property extending approximately 80 feet south. The fill soil will be removed until natural soil is reached (approximately 3 feet). The area will then be covered by soil obtained from the cleaned portion of the former Elliott-Shooting Park property to the previous depth of fill. The area will then be sodded.

The planned use of the property is commercial. The property will be separated from the planned residential area by a fence. No use is planned for the grassy areas on the former Health Club property, and these areas will be regraded, revegetated, and maintained as necessary.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this plan, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Mary J. Erio

Mary J. Erio

MJE/gph

cc Mr Russ Krohn

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION		<input type="checkbox"/> PHONE CALL <input type="checkbox"/> DISCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> FIELD TRIP <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE	
		<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (SPECIFY) _____	
		(Record of item checked above)	
TO Dave Crawford EPA SCOM	FROM Mary Erlo, Burns & McDonnell	DATE 10/14/87	
		TIME 	
SUBJECT Elliott Shooting Park			
SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION			
<p>Mary had submitted a plan for closing the old sedimentation pond on the site and called to check on the status of our review of that plan. I told her I had routed around a letter for approving the plan and agreed to call her when it was to go out. Subsequently the letter was signed. I called Mary who had someone come by and pick it up.</p> <p>Mary had submitted another plan proposing to cover and fence lead-contaminated soil on the former health club property. I had reviewed this plan and believed it could be approved also with certain conditions (i.e. to maintain the cover and the fence and to place a restriction on the deed of the property preventing future land uses which would reexposure or release lead contamination). Mary and I discussed this plan and alternatives that they might have to covering in-place.</p> <p>The new owner of the health club (or east) property is now indicating some resistance to land use restrictions on the deed. I said that this was not a new position from us; we have told him in the past that if he leaves lead contamination on the site (but in a manner which poses no current endangerment) we will need to restrict future land uses. Mary agreed this was not new but indicated that he was now more upset with them (Burns & McDonnell) and with the bank (which owns the shooting park property and which sold him the former health club property). Relationships have deteriorated to the point where Mary had been instructed not to talk to the new property owner (Wellborne) directly. Apparently the bank would be paying for any cleanup of the former health club property.</p> <p>Mary and I agreed that most of the lead contamination on the health club property appears confined to one grid (S31). Therefore may be feasible if Wellborne will not agree to deed restriction that all lead down to 500 ppm could be removed for disposal. Mary initially estimates that the quantity of such soil to be removed would be on the order of 5000 cubic yards.</p> <p>I told Mary we needed to know which alternative they would be pursuing. I will continue to route their plan for covering and fencing the former health club property around EPA with my draft approval letter. However I will call Mary before sending the letter out to determine if that is still the alternative they will be pursuing.</p>			
INFORMATION COPIES			
TO Craig/Bob/Ed Skowronski ATSDR/Gerhardt Braeckel CNSL			

OCT 1 - 1987

To USEPA
726 Minnesota Ave.
Kansas City, KS 66101

Date 10/16/87 **CMPL SECTION**
Project BOATMAN'S 85-170-4
Via Courier

Attention Mr. Dave Crawford

Subject Elliott Shooting Park

Gentlemen

Enclosed are the following

No. of copies	Description and Remarks
1	Revised Plan for former Health Club Property. Please consider this plan in place of Plan submitted on October 9, 1987.

Copies to

° Russ Krohn, TetraTech
Lawrence Lerner Sandler,
Balkin, Hellman & Weinstein

Very truly yours

BURNS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING COMPANY

Bv

W. R. RANS & McDONNELL ENGINEERING CO.
Mary J. Eno

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION		<input type="checkbox"/> PHONE CALL <input type="checkbox"/> DISCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> FIELD TRIP <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (SPECIFY)	
(Record of item checked above)			
TO	FROM		DATE
Mary Erio, Burns & McDonnell	Dave Crawford EPA SLOM Russ Krohn, Tetra Tech		10/20/87
SUBJECT		TIME	
Elliott Shooting Park			
SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION			
<p>Russ & I called to clarify data reported by Mary's letters of 10/9 & 15/87. We asked why 0-3" lead concentrations were so much different on the 2 sets of analyses summarized? Mary said that except for SS1 (5900 mg/kg) the second set of data was from samples collected after additional contaminated soil removal. She pointed out a brief statement describing this above the second data table. SS1 from 0-3" was not resampled as no soil was removed from that grid before resampling.</p> <p>We then discussed proposed plan for the east property (former health club property). Mary said that the current property owner wanted to avoid encumbrances of any land use restrictions. Therefore they propose to remove nearly all of the contaminated soil. Plan now submitted would leave only one data point above 500 mg/kg lead (1821 mg/kg at 6-12" in grid SS5. Data for other depths in this grid are all below 500 mg/kg. Refer to second table.)</p> <p>We agreed that this was close enough to submit to ATSDR for their consideration to determine if this can be left onsite without future land use restrictions. Note that surface concentrations will be below 500 mg/kg and the grid will have additional clean cover applied.</p> <p>Clarified procedures of collecting subsurface soil samples down to 3' on grids SS1/2/3 & 5. Mary said that on normal grids for surface sampling only they would have from 40-50 aliquots. On this data because of the depth of the holes that were drilled for sampling down to 3' they did only 2-3 holes per grid. Mary wanted to know if we thought that this data would be adequately representative of grid sampled or if we would want them to go back and resample with more aliquots. We agreed to consider whether existing data can be accepted. In the mean time Mary will provide additional written description on sample collection for this data.</p> <p>I advised Mary that we had confirmed that there was shooting south of 75th St in the southerly direction. Shooting appears to have been for limited period of time and only occasionally during that time. Nevertheless EPA feels that it should follow up on this and collect samples from surface soils that would most likely be contaminated, if any. Want to meet with City to explain this situation before we send out sampling team. Asked Mary to share this information with her client (the Bank). Agreed to see if representative from the bank can be present when we talk to the City about sampling south of 75th Street, which is now single family residences.</p>			
INFORMATION COPIES			
TO	Ron Ritter CIGL/Steve Wurtz PBAF/Gene Gunn TECH Craig/Gerhardt Braeckel/CNSL/ Jill Biesma Jacobs Eng /Paul Doherty ENSV Tetra Tech SINV/Russ Krohn		